

# CRB



**CALIFORNIA**  
**STATE LIBRARY**  
FOUNDED 1850

**California Research Bureau**

900 N Street, Suite 300  
P.O. Box 942837  
Sacramento, CA 94237-0001  
(916) 653-7843 phone  
(916) 654-5829 fax

## **Undocumented Immigrants: An Annotated Bibliography**

*By Alicia Bugarin, Steven DeBry and  
Martha Jones, Ph.D.*

**NOVEMBER 2005**

**CRB 05-006**

C A L I F O R N I A

R E S E A R C H

B U R E A U

# **Undocumented Immigrants: An Annotated Bibliography**

*By Alicia Bugarin, Steven DeBry and  
Martha Jones, Ph.D.*

**NOVEMBER 2005**

**ISBN. 1-58703-129-9**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>   | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>DISTRIBUTION OF UNAUTHORIZED IMMIGRANTS ACROSS CALIFORNIA COUNTIES...</b> | <b>1</b>  |
| <b>UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRANTS – ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>                | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>NUMBERS AND CHARACTERISTICS .....</b>                                     | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>COSTS AND BENEFITS.....</b>   | <b>7</b>  |
| <i>Labor.....</i>  | <i>10</i> |
| <i>Health .....</i>  | <i>14</i> |
| <i>Education .....</i>   | <i>15</i> |
| <i>Criminal Justice .....</i>  | <i>17</i> |
| <b>BOOKS .....</b>   | <b>19</b> |
| <b>ONLINE BIBLIOGRAPHIES.....</b>  | <b>21</b> |

## INTRODUCTION

The California Research Bureau has received a number of requests concerning the number of unauthorized immigrants in California and the costs and benefits of providing services to these immigrants. The first section of this briefing note shows an estimate of the geographic distribution of unauthorized immigrants across California counties in 2000 and 2005. The second section is an annotated bibliography on recent research concerning the size of the unauthorized immigrant population (in California and the United States) as well as the costs and benefits of providing services to both illegal and legal immigrants.

The U.S. Department of Homeland Security website with statistics on illegal immigrants is: <http://uscis.gov/graphics/shared/aboutus/statistics/illegals.htm>.

## DISTRIBUTION OF UNAUTHORIZED IMMIGRANTS ACROSS CALIFORNIA COUNTIES

For the United States, the former Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) estimated there were seven million unauthorized immigrants in 2000. For California, the figure was 2.209 million.\*

Other estimates of unauthorized immigrants exist. For example, Jeffrey Passal of the Urban Institute estimated the unauthorized population in 2000 in the United States at 8.5 million, but this latter estimate included aliens who had petitions pending or relief from deportation.

Using the 2.209 million unauthorized immigrants estimated for California in 2000 by the former INS, the California Department of Finance (DOF) distributes these estimates across counties using the proportion of the recently arrived foreign-born population in 2000. To project these numbers forward from 2000 to 2005, DOF uses an annual increase of 73,200 unauthorized persons per year, which was the implied annual increase between 1990 and 2000.† Using this methodology, there were about 2.575 million unauthorized persons in California in 2005; in Southern California, there were almost two million.

Table 1 shows the distribution of unauthorized immigrants across regions and counties in 2000 and 2005, sorted by the share of illegal immigrants allocated to each county. About 75 percent of these unauthorized immigrants were residing in the Southern California region. Other regions with large concentrations were the San Joaquin Valley (10.9 percent), the Bay Area (7.6 percent), and the Central Coast (4.7 percent).

---

\* The following publication gives these estimates broken down by state of residence and country of origin. [http://uscis.gov/graphics/shared/aboutus/statistics/III\\_Report\\_1211.pdf](http://uscis.gov/graphics/shared/aboutus/statistics/III_Report_1211.pdf).

† In 1990, there were an estimated 1,476,000 unauthorized persons in California. In 2000, the estimate was 2,209,000 unauthorized. In implied annual increase was 73,2000 unauthorized per year.

Table 1

| <b>California's Undocumented Immigrant Population in 2000 and 2005,<br/>Distribution by County</b> |                      |   |                  |                  |
|--|----------------------|---|------------------|------------------|
|  |                      | Proportion of<br>recently-arrived<br>foreign-born,<br>Census 2000 | 2000             | 2005             |
| <b>CALIFORNIA</b>  |                      | <b>100%</b>   | <b>2,209,000</b> | <b>2,575,000</b> |
| <b><u>REGION</u></b>   | <b><u>COUNTY</u></b> |   |                  |                  |
| Southern California  | Los Angeles          | 49.43%  | 1,091,800        | 1,272,696        |
| Southern California  | Orange               | 8.83%   | 195,108          | 227,434          |
| Southern California  | San Diego            | 6.11%   | 135,063          | 157,441          |
| Southern California  | Riverside            | 3.75%   | 82,868           | 96,599           |
| Southern California  | San Bernardino       | 3.07%   | 67,719           | 78,939           |
| Southern California  | Ventura              | 1.92%   | 42,514           | 49,558           |
| Southern California  | Imperial             | 1.56%   | 34,529           | 40,250           |
| <b>Southern California Total</b>   |                      | <b>74.67%</b>   | <b>1,649,601</b> | <b>1,922,917</b> |
| San Joaquin Valley   | Fresno               | 3.24%   | 71,461           | 83,301           |
| San Joaquin Valley   | Kern                 | 1.89%   | 41,808           | 48,374           |
| San Joaquin Valley   | Tulare               | 1.79%   | 39,585           | 46,144           |
| San Joaquin Valley   | San Joaquin          | 1.23%   | 27,107           | 31,598           |
| San Joaquin Valley   | Stanislaus           | 0.90%   | 19,852           | 23,142           |
| San Joaquin Valley   | Merced               | 0.89%   | 19,702           | 22,966           |
| San Joaquin Valley   | Madera               | 0.56%   | 12,357           | 14,405           |
| San Joaquin Valley   | Kings                | 0.42%   | 9,278            | 10,815           |
| <b>San Joaquin Valley Total</b>  |                      | <b>10.92%</b>   | <b>241,150</b>   | <b>280,745</b>   |
| Bay Area   | Alameda              | 1.17%   | 25,755           | 30,022           |
| Bay Area   | Contra Costa         | 0.62%   | 13,731           | 16,006           |
| Bay Area   | Marin                | 0.15%   | 3,254            | 3,793            |
| Bay Area   | Napa                 | 0.24%   | 5,328            | 6,211            |
| Bay Area   | San Francisco        | 0.86%   | 19,055           | 22,212           |
| Bay Area   | San Mateo            | 1.19%   | 26,203           | 30,545           |
| Bay Area   | Santa Clara          | 2.58%   | 57,050           | 66,502           |
| Bay Area   | Solano               | 0.22%   | 4,957            | 5,778            |
| Bay Area   | Sonoma               | 0.57%   | 12,677           | 14,778           |
| <b>Bay Area Total</b>  |                      | <b>7.60%</b>  | <b>168,010</b>   | <b>195,847</b>   |
| Central Coast  | Monterey             | 1.59%   | 35,139           | 40,961           |
| Central Coast  | San Benito           | 0.18%   | 4,060            | 4,733            |
| Central Coast  | San Luis Obispo      | 0.33%   | 7,336            | 8,552            |
| Central Coast  | Santa Barbara        | 1.47%   | 32,561           | 37,956           |
| Central Coast  | Santa Cruz           | 1.16%   | 25,589           | 29,829           |
| <b>Central Coast Total</b>   |                      | <b>4.73%</b>  | <b>104,685</b>   | <b>122,031</b>   |

**California's Undocumented Immigrant Population in 2000 and 2005,  
Distribution by County (continued)**

|                               |               | Proportion of<br>recently arrived<br>foreign-born,<br>Census 2000 | 2000          | 2005          |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---|---------------|---------------|
| <u>REGION</u>                 | <u>COUNTY</u> |   |               |               |
| Far North                     | Butte         | 0.16%   | 3,450         | 4,022         |
| Far North                     | Colusa        | 0.12%   | 2,675         | 3,118         |
| Far North                     | Del Norte     | 0.02%   | 398           | 464           |
| Far North                     | Glenn         | 0.10%   | 2,145         | 2,500         |
| Far North                     | Humboldt      | 0.02%   | 462           | 538           |
| Far North                     | Lake          | 0.14%   | 3,073         | 3,582         |
| Far North                     | Lassen        | 0.02%   | 367           | 427           |
| Far North                     | Mendocino     | 0.15%   | 3,415         | 3,981         |
| Far North                     | Modoc         | 0.01%   | 117           | 136           |
| Far North                     | Nevada        | 0.01%   | 307           | 358           |
| Far North                     | Plumas        | 0.01%   | 135           | 157           |
| Far North                     | Shasta        | 0.03%   | 607           | 708           |
| Far North                     | Sierra        | 0.00%   | 11            | 13            |
| Far North                     | Siskiyou      | 0.03%   | 689           | 803           |
| Far North                     | Sutter        | 0.14%   | 3,141         | 3,662         |
| Far North                     | Tehama        | 0.10%   | 2,289         | 2,668         |
| Far North                     | Trinity       | 0.00%   | 31            | 36            |
| Far North                     | Yuba          | 0.07%   | 1,522         | 1,774         |
| <b>Far North Total</b>        |               | <b>1.13%</b>  | <b>24,834</b> | <b>28,947</b> |
| Sacramento Metro              | El Dorado     | 0.10%   | 2,138         | 2,493         |
| Sacramento Metro              | Placer        | 0.06%   | 1,423         | 1,658         |
| Sacramento Metro              | Sacramento    | 0.50%   | 11,032        | 12,860        |
| Sacramento Metro              | Yolo          | 0.23%   | 5,083         | 5,925         |
| <b>Sacramento Metro Total</b> |               | <b>0.89%</b>  | <b>19,676</b> | <b>22,936</b> |
| Sierras                       | Alpine        | 0.00%   | 4             | 5             |
| Sierras                       | Amador        | 0.01%   | 157           | 183           |
| Sierras                       | Calaveras     | 0.00%   | 84            | 98            |
| Sierras                       | Inyo          | 0.01%   | 261           | 304           |
| Sierras                       | Mariposa      | 0.00%   | 71            | 82            |
| Sierras                       | Mono          | 0.01%   | 298           | 348           |
| Sierras                       | Tuolumne      | 0.01%   | 172           | 201           |
| <b>Sierras Total</b>          |               | <b>0.04%</b>  | <b>1,047</b>  | <b>1,221</b>  |



# UNDOCUMENTED IMMIGRANTS – ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

## NUMBERS AND CHARACTERISTICS

Rise, Peak and Decline: Trends in U.S. Immigration 1992 – 2004. By Jeffrey S. Passel and Roberto Suro, Pew Hispanic Center. September 27, 2005. 56 p.

<http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/53.pdf>.

Executive Summary <http://pewhispanic.org/files/execsum/53.pdf>.

At the turn of the 21st century, immigration levels increased dramatically. This spike took the total inflow to more than 1.5 million in 1999 and 2000—a level about 35% higher than in the middle of the decade. This peak proved to be short-lived. After 2000, inflows of immigrants decreased by about 25% to roughly the levels of the mid-1990s, returning to 1.1 million in 2003. The most recent data show a slight uptick in the flow to more than 1.2 million in 2004.... From 1992 to 2004, the unauthorized share of immigration inflows increased and the share that was legal decreased. From 1999 through at least 2004, more unauthorized migrants than authorized migrants were entering the United States.

Unauthorized Migrants: Numbers and Characteristics: Background Briefing Prepared for Task Force on Immigration and America's Future. By Jeffrey S. Passel, Pew Hispanic Center, June 2005, 44 p. <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/46.pdf>.

The report builds on previous work that estimated the size and geographic dispersal of the undocumented population and offers a portrait of that population in unprecedented detail by examining family composition, educational attainment, income and employment. ... Extensive data on the employment of unauthorized migrants maps their presence in many sectors of the U.S. labor force.

The Underground Labor Force Is Rising To The Surface. By Robert Justich and Betty Ng. Bear Stearns Asset Management. January 3, 2005. 14 p.

<http://www.bearstearns.com/bscportal/pdfs/underground.pdf>.

Illegal immigrants constitute a large and growing force in the political, economic, and investment spheres in the United States. The size of this extra-legal segment of the population is significantly understated because the official U.S. census does not capture the total number of illegal immigrants. In turn, the growth of the underground work force is increasingly concealing the economic impact of this below-market labor supply. This research identifies significant evidence that the census estimates of undocumented immigrants may be capturing as little as half of the total undocumented population. This gross undercounting is a serious accounting issue, which could ultimately lead to government policy errors in the future.



Unauthorized Aliens in the United States: Estimates Since 1986. By Ruth Ellen Wasem, Congressional Research Service, The Library of Congress, September 15, 2004, 6p.  
[http://www.immigrationforum.org/documents/crs/CRS\\_undocumented\\_2004.pdf](http://www.immigrationforum.org/documents/crs/CRS_undocumented_2004.pdf).

This report presents data estimating the number of unauthorized aliens who have been living in the United States since 1986. There have been a variety of estimates of the unauthorized resident alien population over this period, sometimes with substantially different results. This report is limited to data analyses of the U.S. Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS) so that there is a basic standard of comparison over time. The CPS estimates indicate that the number of illegal aliens has risen from 3.2 million in 1986 to 8.5 million in 2000 and 9.3 million in 2002. Research suggests a constellation of factors have contributed to the increase in unauthorized resident aliens, including the "push-pull" of a prosperous economy, the inadvertent consequence of border enforcement policies that have curbed the fluid movement of migrant workers, and the backlog in processing immigrant petitions.

Undocumented Immigrants: Facts and Figures. By Jeffrey S. Passel, Randy Capps, and Michael Fix, Urban Institute Immigration Studies Program, January 12, 2004, 4 p.  
[http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/1000587\\_undoc\\_immigrants\\_facts.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/1000587_undoc_immigrants_facts.pdf).

This report provides basic descriptive data on the undocumented population. Based on the March 2002 Current Population Survey, the report estimates that there were 9.3 million undocumented immigrants in the United States. Mexicans made up 57 percent of the total. About six million undocumented were working and these workers earned considerably less than working U.S. citizens. Contrary to public perception, women made up a substantial share, 41 percent, of the adult undocumented population. About 1.6 million children under 18 in the United States were themselves undocumented immigrants. Another three million children with undocumented parents were U.S. citizens because they were born here.

Estimates of the Unauthorized Immigrant Population Residing in the United States: 1990 to 2000. Office of Policy and Planning, U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, January 2003, 19 p.  
[http://uscis.gov/graphics/shared/aboutus/statistics/III\\_Report\\_1211.pdf](http://uscis.gov/graphics/shared/aboutus/statistics/III_Report_1211.pdf). Executive Summary: <http://uscis.gov/graphics/shared/aboutus/statistics/2000ExecSumm.pdf>.

This paper describes estimates of the unauthorized immigrant population residing in the United States in January 2000, by state of residence and country of origin. The estimates were developed using data on the foreign-born population from the 2000 Census, INS administrative data, and a new methodology for estimating annual trends in population growth. It is the third in a series of estimates developed by the Immigration and Naturalization Service. ... The INS estimates that the total unauthorized immigrant population residing in the United States in January 2000 was 7.0 million.

How Many Undocumented: The Numbers Behind the U.S.-Mexico Migration Talks. By B. Lindsay Lowell and Roberto Suro, Pew Hispanic Center. March 12, 2002. 11 p. <http://pewhispanic.org/files/reports/6.pdf>.

This study estimates that undocumented workers have become a very substantial presence in the sectors where they are concentrated. More than a million undocumented persons are employed in manufacturing and a similar number in the service industries. More than 600,000 work in construction and more than 700,000 in restaurants.

## **COSTS AND BENEFITS**

Why Does Immigration Divide America? Public Finance and Political Opposition to Open Borders. By Gordon H. Hanson, National Bureau of Economic Research, March 2005, 103 p. <http://irpshome.ucsd.edu/faculty/gohanson/HansonIIEmanuscript.pdf>.

The benefits and costs of immigration appear to be distributed quite unevenly. Capital owners, landowners, and employers capture most of the benefits associated with immigration, which they enjoy in the form of higher factor returns. Taxpayers in high-immigration U.S. states shoulder most of immigration's fiscal costs, which they bear in the form of higher taxes that go to pay for public services used by immigrant households. On net, the economic impact of immigration on the United States is small. However, small net changes in national income mask potentially large changes in the distribution of income.

Distributional changes appear to be an important ingredient in how individuals form opinions about immigration policy. Survey data suggest that individuals are more opposed to immigration if they (a) are more exposed to immigration's labor-market consequences, as are low-income workers living in states with large immigrant populations, or (b) are more exposed to immigration's public-finance consequences, as are high-income workers living in states with high immigrant uptake of public assistance. Policies that have reduced the fiscal costs of immigration, such as welfare reform in the 1990s, appear to have softened political opposition to immigration. The report also discusses the current political gridlock in the U.S. regarding immigration policy and offers strategies for reform.

Is the New Immigration Really So Bad? By David Card, Department of Economics, University of California, Berkeley, January 2005, 43 p. <http://www.phil.frb.org/econ/conf/immigration/card.pdf>.

This paper reviews the recent evidence on U.S. immigration, focusing on two key questions: (1) Does immigration reduce the labor market opportunities of less-skilled natives? (2) Have immigrants who arrived after the 1965 Immigration Reform Act successfully assimilated? ... Overall, evidence that immigrants have harmed the opportunities of less-educated natives is scant. On the question of

assimilation, the success of U.S.-born children of immigrants is a key yardstick. By this metric, post-1965 immigrants are doing reasonably well: second generation sons and daughters have higher education and wages than the children of natives. Even children of the least-educated immigrant-origin groups have closed most of the education gap with the children of natives.

The Costs of Illegal Immigration to California. By Jack Martin and Ira Mehlman, The Federation for American Immigration Reform, November 2004, 19 p.

[http://www.fairus.org/site/PageServer?pagename=iic\\_immigrationissuecentersffec](http://www.fairus.org/site/PageServer?pagename=iic_immigrationissuecentersffec).

Analysis of census data indicates that California's illegal immigrant population is costing the state's taxpayers more than \$10.5 billion per year for education, medical care and incarceration. Even if the estimated tax contributions of illegal immigrant workers are subtracted, net outlays still amount to nearly \$9 billion per year.

The High Cost of Cheap Labor: Illegal Immigration and the Federal Budget. By Steven A. Camarota, Center for Immigration Studies, August 2004, 48 p.

<http://www.cis.org/articles/2004/fiscal.pdf>.

This study is one of the first to estimate the total impact of illegal immigration on the federal budget. Most previous studies focused on the state and local level and examined only costs or tax payments, but not both. Based on 2002 census data, this study finds that, when all taxes are paid (direct and indirect) and all costs are considered, illegal households created a net fiscal deficit at the federal level of more than \$10 billion. The study also estimates that, if there were an amnesty for illegal aliens, the net fiscal deficit would grow to nearly \$29 billion.

What Are the Consequences of an Amnesty for Undocumented Immigrants? By Pia M. Orrenius and Madeline Zavodny, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta. Working Paper 2004-10, May 2004, 25 p. <http://www.frbatlanta.org/filelegacydocs/wp0410.pdf>.

This paper discusses the current position of undocumented immigrants in the U.S. economy and the likely economic consequences of an amnesty program. The results of the 1986 amnesty indicate several lessons for designing an amnesty plan that would improve the lives of the currently undocumented, minimize adverse effects on other groups, and stem the continuing tide of undocumented immigrants.

Technological Superiority and the Losses from Migration. By Donald R. Davis and David E. Weinstein, National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper 8971, June 2002. 47 p. <http://papers.nber.org/papers/w8971.pdf>. CIS Backgrounder, 8 p.

<http://www.cis.org/articles/2005/back205.pdf>.

This study employs a new approach to examine the impact of immigration on the U.S. economy. Unlike earlier studies, the authors do not treat the movement of

immigrant labor into this country in isolation. Older studies assumed that abundant resources and demand for labor were the primary reason for immigration, assumptions more appropriate to the 19th century. This study assumes that the technological superiority of the modern American economy and resulting high standard of living is the primary factor motivating immigration. The study also takes into account the new global economy, including the movement of capital as well as trade. Their findings show that immigration creates a net loss for natives of nearly \$70 billion annually.

Immigration in a Changing Economy: California Experiences. 1997. 338p. Immigration in a Changing Economy: California Experiences, Questions and Answers, 1998, 51 p. By Kevin F. McCarthy and Georges Vernez, The RAND Corporation.  
<http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR854/>.  
<http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR854.1/>.

RAND undertook this study (1) to promote a better understanding of the immigration phenomenon in California by assessing the effects it has had over the years on the state's demography, economy, people, and institutions and (2) to identify the present and future challenges immigration poses for California. There are lessons to be drawn for other states, the nation, and even other countries. ...this volume takes a long-term view. It goes back to 1960, before the current era of large-scale immigration began, and looks systematically at how immigration has interacted with other demographic and economic trends over the subsequent decades to affect the state. It also examines how immigrants from different countries of origin are faring in their pursuit of the American dream. Finally, it identifies the challenges that California faces in integrating its newcomers and their children and how federal and state policies might maximize the benefits and minimize the costs of immigration in the future.

Briefing Paper: Addressing Immigration Issues in California. By the California Senate Office of Research, March 1994.

This study gives a snapshot of California's immigration landscape in the early 1990s. It looks at demographics, costs and benefits, the potential impacts of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), and the history of state and federal immigration laws. The costs of illegal immigration to the state of California are discussed in Appendix B. According to the Department of Finance, the 1994-95 annual cost of providing services to people illegally residing in California as a result of inadequate border control was estimated to be \$2.5 billion. These costs include: \$1.7 billion for educating illegal immigrants in California's public schools, \$402 million for the cost of illegal immigrants in California's correctional system, and \$400 million for health services provided to illegal immigrants under the state's Medi-Cal program. Appendix B also includes a discussion of the 1994 Department of Finance methodologies used for calculating these costs.

## ***Labor***

Mexico's ID Makes Major Gains in the U.S. By Jennifer Delson and Anna Gorman, *Los Angeles Times*, September 27, 2005, B2.

Despite opposition from groups that oppose illegal immigration, the *matricula consular* --an identification card issued by the Mexican government -- has become increasingly common and widely used in California. The number issued statewide has jumped from just under 190,000 five years ago to nearly 360,000 last year. Nationwide, the number has gone from 528,000 to more than 4.7 million last year, according to the Mexican government. Other countries, primarily in Latin America, are taking note of the *matricula's* success. Argentina, El Salvador and Honduras either distribute comparable cards or plan to this fall. Colombia began a pilot program in late 2004. Resembling drivers' licenses, the Mexican photo identification cards are a boon to U.S. businesses. They allow companies such as Sprint, Costco and Wells Fargo to capture the buying power of an eager and growing group of consumers: illegal immigrants. The cards can be used to establish credit, open bank accounts, buy insurance and apply for government services.

A Profile of Low-Income Working Immigrant Families. By Randolph Capps, Michael Fix, Everett Henderson, and Jane Reardon-Anderson, The Urban Institute, June 30, 2005, 7p. [http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/311206\\_B-67.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/311206_B-67.pdf)

Immigrants are a large and growing share of U.S. workers and low-income working families. This brief provides an analysis of benefit and service use among families of immigrant workers with children. Using data from the 2002 National Survey of America's Families, the authors examine safety net programs, including the earned income tax credit, cash welfare, food stamps, housing assistance, health insurance coverage, and child care.

Backfire at the Border: Why Enforcement Without Legalization Cannot Stop Illegal Immigration. By Douglas S. Massey, Center for Trade Policy Studies, The Cato Institute, June 13, 2005, 16 p. <http://www.freetrade.org/pubs/pas/tpa-029.pdf>.

This report states that an estimated 10 million or more people reside in the U.S. without legal documentation in 2005. For the past two decades, the U.S. government has pursued a contradictory policy on North American integration that has made the problem of illegal immigration worse. While pursuing commercial integration through NAFTA, it has sought to unilaterally curb the flow of labor across the U.S.-Mexican border by increased border enforcement. This has resulted in pushing immigration flows into more remote regions, which caused a tripling of the death rate at the border, a dramatic fall in the rate of apprehension, and an increase in the cost to U.S. taxpayers of making an arrest along the border. In addition, enforcement has driven up the cost of crossing the

border illegally, with the unintended consequence of encouraging illegal immigrants to stay longer in the U.S. to recoup the cost of entry. The report recommends that Congress should enact a temporary visa program that would allow foreign workers to work in the U.S. without restriction for a certain limited time. Undocumented workers already in the U.S. who do not have a criminal record should be given temporary legal status.

New Foreign Immigrants and the Labor Market in the U.S.: The Unprecedented Effects of New Foreign Immigration on the Growth of the Nation's Labor Force and Its Employed Population, 2000 to 2004. By Andrew Sum and others, Center for Labor Market Statistics, American Youth Policy Forum, January 2005. 33 p.

The study presents estimated findings on the contributions of net international migration (foreign immigration minus emigration) to U.S. population growth over the 2000-2004 period and to the growth in the resident population of selected states, including California. The paper also examines the age composition of the new immigrant population (those arriving in the U.S. between 2000 and 2004), their labor force behavior and the share of labor force and employment growth generated by new immigrants. Demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of new immigrants are presented by educational attainment subgroup. Characteristics of the jobs held by employed new immigrants (class of worker status, industries of their employers, occupations) are described and compared with those of native-born workers.

Embracing Illegals. By Brian Grow, A. Carter, R. Crockett and G. Smith, *Business Week*, July 18, 2005, 6 p.

[http://www.businessweek.com/print/magazine/content/05\\_29/b3943001\\_mz001.htm?chan](http://www.businessweek.com/print/magazine/content/05_29/b3943001_mz001.htm?chan) (accessed August 25, 2005).

This cover story describes how undocumented immigrants have been the target of national attention for decades, largely for negative reasons. Yet all the while, farms, hotels, restaurants, small manufacturers, and other employers have continued to hire the undocumented with little regard to the federal laws intended to stop them. The fast-growing undocumented population is coming to be seen as an untapped engine of economic growth. U.S. consumer companies large and small are eager to cater to undocumented immigrants who live and work in the U.S. Businesses are giving loans, insurance and banking accounts on the basis of the *matrícula* card. Wells Fargo Bank, for example, has half a million *matrícula* accounts, a majority of them opened by unauthorized aliens who lack U.S. citizenship papers. Blue Cross of California sells health insurance to *matrícula* holders; Sprint Corporation accepts such an I.D. for cell-phone contracts.



Online Extra: A Store of Their Own. By Brian Grow, *Business Week*, July 18, 2005, 2 p.

This story illustrates how discounter La Curacao has found a lucrative niche by serving immigrants. The Curacao not only offers a variety of products, Spanish signage, and multilingual staff, but it also hands out credit to those who are often in the country illegally, possess little credit history, and work poorly-paying jobs. La Curacao posted sales of more than \$75 million in 2003, “drawing immigrants wary of big companies - and government officials - out of the underground economy has been the cornerstone of its success.”

Online Extra: A Massive Economic Development Boom. By Patricia O’Connell, *Business Week*, July 18, 2005, 2 p.

In this interview, Dr. Raul Hinojosa, an expert on the undocumented immigrant population, argues that illegal immigrants have a positive effect on the U.S. economy because of their consumer power and low wages.

Impacts of Policy Reforms on Labor Migration from Rural Mexico to the United States. By Susan M. Richter, J. Edward Taylor, and Antonio Naude, National Bureau of Economic Research, Working Paper 11428, June 2005.  
<http://papers.nber.org/papers/W11428>.

Using new survey data from Mexico, a dynamic econometric model is estimated to test the effect of policy changes on the flow of migrant labor from rural Mexico to the United States and to test for differential effects of policy changes on male and female migration. Both IRCA and NAFTA reduced the share of rural Mexicans working in the United States. Increased U.S. border enforcement had the opposite effect. The impacts of these policy variables are small compared with those of macroeconomic variables and even smaller compared with that of migration networks, as reflected in past migration by villagers to the United States. The effects of all of these variables on migration propensities differ quantitatively, and in some cases qualitatively, by gender.

Immigrant Remitting Behavior and Its Developmental Consequences for Mexico and El Salvador. By Jeronimo Cortina and Rodolfo de la Garza. Tomas Rivera Policy Institute. December 2004. 43 p. <http://www.trpi.org/PDFs/remit.pdf>.

The authors analyze current literature on why immigrants remit and then give the results of their 2003 Immigrant Remitting Behavior Survey of Mexican and Salvadoran immigrants, all of whom were remitters. The survey showed that approximately 70 percent of immigrant remittances were sent for family-oriented purposes whereas only 30 percent remitted for both family and collective purposes. When it was released, this survey was the only available empirical analysis of why emigrants say they remit. Subsequent sections of the report test two models regarding motives that cause immigrants to remit and analyze the developmental consequences of remittances on Mexico.

Holding the Line? The Effect of Recent Border Buildup on Unauthorized Immigration. By Belinda I. Reyes, Hans P. Johnson, and Richard Van Swearingen, Public Policy Institute of California, July 2002, 172 p.  
[http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/R\\_702BRR.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/R_702BRR.pdf).

This report addresses the following questions concerning the effectiveness of controlling unauthorized immigration along the U.S.-Mexican border.

- Has increased border enforcement changed decisions to migrate?
- Has it changed where and how people cross the U.S.-Mexican border?
- Has it led to an increase in migrant deaths?
- Has it altered how long immigrants stay once they arrive?
- Has it reduced the total number of unauthorized immigrants living in the U.S.?
- What other policy options might help curb unauthorized immigration?

Self-Selection among Undocumented Immigrants from Mexico. By Pia M. Orrenius and Madeline Zavodny, Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta. Working Paper 2001-01, February 2001, 38 p. <http://www.frbatlanta.org/frbatlanta/filelegacydocs/wp0101.pdf>.

This paper examines the effect of changes in migration determinants on the skill level of undocumented immigrants from Mexico. The authors focus on the effect of changes in economic conditions, migrant networks, and border enforcement on the educational attainment of Mexican-born men who cross the border illegally. ... Improvements in U.S. and Mexican economic conditions are associated with a decline in the average educational levels of undocumented immigrants. Stricter border enforcement is associated with higher average skill levels.



## ***Health***

Covering New Americans: A Review of Federal and State Policies Related to Immigrants' Eligibility and Access to Publicly Funded Health Insurance. By Shawn Fremstad and Laura Cox, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. November 2004. 42 p. <http://www.kff.org/medicaid/upload/Covering-New-Americans-A-Review-of-Federal-and-State-Policies-Related-to-Immigrants-Eligibility-and-Access-to-Publicly-Funded-Health-Insurance-Report.pdf>.

This brief provides an overview of health coverage challenges facing immigrants, the federal rules regarding immigrants' eligibility for Medicaid and State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP), and state efforts to provide replacement coverage for immigrants who are ineligible for Medicaid and SCHIP. It also reviews actions states can take to encourage enrollment of eligible immigrants in public health coverage and to improve immigrants' access to care.

The Decline in Medicaid Use by Noncitizens since Welfare Reform. By Marie Wang and John Holahan, The Urban Institute, 2003, 6 p. [http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/900621\\_HPOnline\\_5.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/900621_HPOnline_5.pdf).

This analysis finds that Medicaid enrollment among noncitizens did in fact *decrease* after welfare reform as intended by law, and that noncitizens are much less likely than native citizens to receive Medicaid. However, a report released by the Center for Immigration Studies (CIS) in March 2003 suggested the opposite—that enrollment of noncitizens in Medicaid increased after welfare reform and remains much greater than that of native households. ... A closer examination of the CIS analysis shows that their methods overstate the percentage of the population receiving Medicaid and the share of immigrants on Medicaid, resulting in misleading conclusions about welfare use among immigrants.

Medical Emergency: Costs of Uncompensated Care in Southwest Border Counties. By MGT of America, United States/Mexico Border Counties Coalition, September 2002, 168 p. <http://www.bordercounties.org/vertical/Sites/{B4A0F1FF-7823-4C95-8D7A-F5E400063C73}/uploads/{FAC57FA3-B310-4418-B2E7-B68A89976DC1}.PDF>.

Southwest border counties—the 24 counties adjoining the Mexican border—are facing a medical emergency. A score of federal and state policies, such as declining federal Medicaid reimbursements and rising professional liability insurance costs, are contributing to an imminent health care crisis. The disproportionate burden placed on southwest border counties for providing emergency healthcare services to undocumented immigrants is compounding an already alarming state of affairs.

## *Education*

Educational Progress Across Immigrant Generations in California. By Deborah Reed, Laura E. Hill, Christopher Jepsen, and Hans P. Johnson, Public Policy Institute of California, 2005. [http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/R\\_905DRR.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/R_905DRR.pdf).

The authors find that across all immigrant groups, second- and third-generation Californians consistently attain higher educational levels than their parents or grandparents. However, there is evidence of uneven progress across different immigrant groups and low educational attainment among Mexican Americans, even by the third generation, remains cause for concern. The research indicates that children most at risk of low educational achievement are those with parents who did not graduate from high school. The report outlines opportunities for policymakers to improve this situation by, for example, targeted mentoring of children whose parents have low education levels; supporting education programs in the workplace; and continuing investments in community colleges and adult education programs, especially in the area of English language, remedial and vocational courses.

Illegal Alien Schoolchildren: Issues in Estimating State-by-State Costs. By the U.S. General Accounting Office, GAO-04-733, June 2004, 29 p. <http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d04733.pdf>.

Current government information is not sufficient to directly estimate the state-by-state costs of educating illegal alien schoolchildren. Although a variety of data is available, no government source estimates the numbers of illegal alien schoolchildren for most or all states. The Census Bureau has outlined a preliminary plan to develop indirect state-by-state estimates of the resident illegal alien population by age, which could help determine the number of schoolchildren in that population. Even if age-group estimates were successfully developed, they would not be available before 2007-09. Approaches to state-by-state cost estimation differ in the extent to which they attempt to account for various factors that can affect costs. The GAO surveyed 22 state governments concerning the annual costs of schooling illegal alien children, but only three states provided the information (Texas, North Carolina and Pennsylvania). Cost estimates ranged from \$50 million to \$87.5 million in Pennsylvania to \$932 million to \$1.04 billion in Texas.

U.S. Immigration – Trends and Implications for Schools. By Michael Fix and Jeffery S. Passel, The Urban Institute, 2003, 32 p. [http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410654\\_NABEPresentation.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/410654_NABEPresentation.pdf).

This presentation sets the demographic context of the implementation of the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. The study seeks to:

- Provide an overview of major trends in immigration that are having profound impacts on the nation's schools;

- Draw a statistical portrait of the nation's immigrant and limited English proficient (LEP) student population that builds on The Urban Institute's *Overlooked and Underserved: Immigrant Students in U.S. Secondary Schools* (Ruiz de Velasco, Fix and Clewell, 2000); and,
- Discuss the comparative merits of using Census versus state-reported measures of LEP students and their implications for distributing Title III funding under NCLB for immigrant and limited English proficient students.

College Tuition and Undocumented Immigrants. By Christine Walton, National Conference of State Legislatures, October 2003, 2 p.

<http://www.ncsl.org/programs/educ/undocimmigrant.htm>.

A 1996 federal law addressing illegal immigration included a provision affecting state residency requirements for in-state tuition rates, traditionally a matter of state law. Now, states are prohibited from offering in-state tuition rates to unauthorized immigrant students unless other U.S. citizens are eligible for the same rate. Since 2001, more than 20 states have introduced bills addressing in-state tuition for undocumented immigrants. Seven states have established new residency standards allowing unauthorized immigrant students to receive in-state tuition under certain conditions. Students without legal immigrant status continue to be ineligible for federal financial aid, although states are required to provide K-12 public education as a result of a 1982 Supreme Court decision. .... Not helping students attend college results in much greater costs to the state and contributes to an uneducated workforce.

Immigration Bedevils State Lawmakers. By Mark K. Matthews. September 2, 2005.

<http://www.stateline.org/live/ViewPage.action?siteNodeId=136&languageId=1&contentId=51980>.

This article is the third in a series of articles focusing on illegal immigration in the states of the Southwest. Inundated by millions of illegal newcomers and frustrated by the lack of a coherent federal policy, states in the Southwest and beyond are taking more immigration matters into their own hands. The result is a patchwork of new state laws retooling workers' rights, driver's license eligibility, taxpayer-funded benefits and criminal justice for illegal immigrants. Nine states, including California, now allow illegal immigrants who grew up in the state to attend public colleges at in-state tuition rates and three states (New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas) also offer scholarships to illegal immigrant students.

## ***Criminal Justice***

Number of Inmates in the Institution Population Who Have a U.S. INS Hold, Have a Potential U.S. INS Hold or Do Not Have an Actual or Potential U.S. INS Hold by Country of Birth and Hold Status, As of December 31, 2004. By California Department of Corrections, Data Analysis Unit, Offender Information Services Branch. January 2005 (unpublished). 17 p.

This document includes several tables with statistical information on the hold status of inmates in the California institution population. The table below, for example, summarizes information on the number of inmates by country of birth and hold status for the 10 countries of birth with 100 persons or more having a US INS hold.

| <b>Number of Inmates in the California Institution Population<br/>By Country of Birth and Hold Status<br/>As of December 31, 2004<br/>(Countries with more 100 persons or more having a U.S. INS Hold)</b>  |                         |                                |                      |                |
|---|-------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| <b>Country of Birth</b>   | <b>No U.S. INS Hold</b> | <b>Potential U.S. INS Hold</b> | <b>U.S. INS Hold</b> | <b>Total</b>   |
| Mexico  | 2,338                   | 2,687                          | 12,429               | 17,454         |
| El Salvador   | 119                     | 174                            | 871                  | 1,164          |
| Vietnam   | 199                     | 168                            | 529                  | 896            |
| Guatemala   | 85                      | 62                             | 361                  | 508            |
| Cuba  | 52                      | 65                             | 289                  | 406            |
| Honduras  | 38                      | 36                             | 229                  | 303            |
| Laos  | 52                      | 48                             | 185                  | 285            |
| Philippine Islands  | 156                     | 48                             | 183                  | 387            |
| Cambodia  | 31                      | 19                             | 155                  | 205            |
| Thailand  | 59                      | 55                             | 143                  | 257            |
| Unknown   | 1,254                   | 594                            | 445                  | 2,293          |
| All other countries combined*   | 137,712                 | 662                            | 1,407                | 139,781        |
| <b>Total</b>  | <b>142,095</b>          | <b>4,618</b>                   | <b>17,226</b>        | <b>163,939</b> |
| Source: Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, Data Analysis Unit, Offender Information Services Branch, January 2005.   |                         |                                |                      |                |
| * Countries with less than 100 persons having a US INS Hold are included in this category. The complete table, which has a detailed distribution for 165 countries of birth, is available from the California State Library, California Research Bureau upon request. |                         |                                |                      |                |

Information on Certain Illegal Aliens Arrested in the United States. By the U.S. Government Accountability Office. GAO-05-646R, May 2005, 31 p.  
<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d05646r.pdf> Information on Criminal Aliens Incarcerated in Federal and State Prisons and Local Jails. By the U.S. Government Accountability Office. GAO-05-337R, April 2005, 38 p.  
<http://www.gao.gov/new.items/d05337r.pdf>.

How many times have criminal aliens been arrested? How many and what type of criminal offense have they been arrested for? What states were they arrested in? How many criminal aliens were incarcerated? What is the country of citizenship or country of birth of these inmates? What are the estimated costs of incarcerating criminal aliens?

Crime & the Illegal Alien: The Fallout from Crippled Immigration Enforcement. By Heather Mac Donald, Center for Immigration Studies, June 2004, 12 p.  
<http://www.cis.org/articles/2004/back704.pdf>.

Some of the most violent criminals at large today are illegal aliens. Yet in cities where crime from these lawbreakers is highest, the police cannot use the most obvious tool to apprehend them: their immigration status.... But however pernicious in themselves, sanctuary rules are a symptom of a much broader disease: the near total loss of control over immigration policy.

Illegal Immigrants in U.S.-Mexico Border Counties: Cost of Law Enforcement, Criminal Justice and Emergency Medical Services. By Tanis J. Salant, University of Arizona. U.S./Mexico Border Counties Coalition, January 2001.  
<http://bordercounties.advocateoffice.com/vertical/Sites/{B4A0F1FF-7823-4C95-8D7A-F5E400063C73}/uploads/{14A3A65B-A0DE-4F10-A59E-1E84ADF7DFE0}.pdf>.  
California, <http://bordercounties.advocateoffice.com/vertical/Sites/{B4A0F1FF-7823-4C95-8D7A-F5E400063C73}/uploads/{2B7DEAC0-2123-4979-AA17-C4A0455E2615}.pdf>.

A small portion of illegal immigrants, as well as of the immigrant population residing illegally or entering legally to work every day, gets caught committing a state felony or two or more misdemeanors. When they are apprehended on a state offense, they are not deported. Rather, they enter the county law enforcement and criminal justice system and undergo the adjudication process just as any U.S. citizen or legal visitor would. In the last few years, Congress and the media have addressed the financial burden on state and county prosecutors of processing drug smugglers, a federal crime, but public and congressional awareness of the financial burden on county governments of detaining and adjudicating criminal illegal immigrants is only beginning to emerge.

Illegal Aliens in Federal, State and Local Criminal Justice Systems. By Rebecca L. Clark and Scott A. Anderson, The Urban Institute, 2000, 10 p.

[http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/41\\_0366\\_alien\\_justice\\_sum.pdf](http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/41_0366_alien_justice_sum.pdf).

This research describes the characteristics of illegal aliens in the criminal justice system at federal, state, and local levels. A goal of this project is to be as nationally representative as possible, given the limits of existing data sets. ... The state-level analysis is based on data collected for the State Crime Alien Assistance Program (SCAAP) on the seven states with the most illegal aliens, Arizona, California, Florida, Illinois, New Jersey, New York and Texas.

## BOOKS

Mexifornia: A State of Becoming. By Victor Davis Hanson, California State University, Fresno, 2003. <http://www.encounterbooks.com/books/mest/mest.html>.

- What is so Different about Mexican Immigration?
- The Universe of the Illegal Alien,
- The Mind of the Host,
- The Old Simplicity that Worked,
- The New Gods that Failed, and
- Epilogue: Forks in the Road.

The Immigration Debate: Studies on the Economic, Demographic, and Fiscal Effects of Immigration. By Editors James P. Smith, Panel on the Demographic and Economic Impacts of Immigration, and Barry Edmonston, Committee on National Statistics, National Research Council, 1998, 472 p.

<http://books.nap.edu/books/0309059984/html/index.html>.

- Introduction,
- An Economic Framework for Assessing the Fiscal Impacts of Immigration,
- Fiscal Impacts of Immigrant and Native Households: New Jersey Case Study,
- The Fiscal Impacts of Immigrants: California Case Study,
- The Current Fiscal Impact of Immigrants and their Descendents: Beyond the Immigrant Household,
- Immigrants and Natives in General Equilibrium Trade Models, and
- Labor Market Outcomes of Female Immigrants in the United States.

The New Americans: Economic, Demographic, and Fiscal Effects of Immigration. By Editors James P. Smith, Panel on the Demographic and Economic Impacts of Immigration and Barry Edmonston, Committee on National Statistics, National Research Council, 1997, 488 p. <http://books.nap.edu/books/0309063566/html/index.html>.

- The Immigration Debate,
- Background to Contemporary U.S. Immigration,
- The Face of the U.S. Population in 2050,
- Immigration's Effects on Jobs and Wages: First Principles,
- Immigration's Effects on Jobs and Wages: Empirical Evidence,
- Do Immigrants Impose a Net Fiscal Burden? Annual Estimates,
- The Future Fiscal Impacts of Current Immigrants, and
- The Social Dimensions of Immigration.

Immigration in a Changing Economy: California's Experience. By Kevin F. McCarthy and Georges Vernez, RAND, Center for Research on Immigration Policy, National Defense Research Institute, 1997, 338 p. <http://www.rand.org/publications/MR/MR854.1/index.html>.

- Introduction,
- The Changing Character of Recent Immigration to California,
- Profile of California's Recent Immigrants,
- Effects on the Socio-Demographic Profile of the State,
- Integration of Immigrants,
- The Changing Economy and the Immigrant Labor Force,
- The Changing Role of Immigrants in the Economy,
- Immigrants' Effects on the Economy,
- Effects on Native-Born Workers,
- Effects on the Public Sector: The New Challenge, and
- Discussion and Policy Implications.

Local Fiscal Effects of Illegal Immigration: Report of a Workshop. By Editors Barry Edmonston, Committee on National Statistics, and Ronald Lee, Committee on Population, National Research Council, 1996, 40 p. <http://books.nap.edu/books/030905592X/html/index.html>.

- Introduction,
- Case Studies (including Los Angeles County),
- Fiscal Effects, and
- Conclusions.

Mexican Americans: The Ambivalent Minority. By Peter Skerry, UCLA Center for American Politics and Public Policy, 1993, 463 p.

<http://www.hup.harvard.edu/catalog/SKEMEX.html>.

- Introduction and Overview
  - The Primacy of Politics
  - San Antonio: Getting Ahead and Getting Even
  - Los Angeles: Moving In, Out, and Up
  - Paradoxical Political Outcomes
- Four Styles of Mexican-American Politics
  - Friends-and-Neighbors Politics and the Need for Organization
  - Obstacles to Organization Politics
  - Elite-Network Politics: The Clique and Its Challengers
  - Protest Politics: Symbolism and Symbiosis
- The National Perspective
  - The State of Mexican-American Opinion
  - Assimilation and Its Discontents
  - Newcomers in a New Nation

## ONLINE BIBLIOGRAPHIES

The Urban Institute-

<http://www.urban.org/Template.cfm?Section=ByTopic&NavMenuID=62&TopicID=192&TopicName=Immigration>.

Center on Budget and Policy Priorities-

<http://www.cbpp.org/pubs/immpub.htm>.

Center for Immigration Studies-

<http://www.cis.org/topics/illegalimmigration.html#Publications>.

Pew Hispanic Center-

<http://pewhispanic.org/topics/index.php?TopicID=16>.

RAND Center for Research on Immigration Policy-

<http://www.rand.org/education/projects/crip.html>.